The Lutheran Liturgy and Life

By

J. F. Krueger

BX
8061
A1
K78
1930
GTU
Storage

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

THE LUTHERAN LITURGY AND LIFE

By

Rev. Prof. J. F. Krueger, Ph.D., D.D., LLD.

Installation Address at Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

THE WITTENBERG BULLETIN

Vol. 27 MARCH 10, 1930 No. 8

Published Weekly in Springfield, Ohio, by Wittenberg College.

BX 8967
.A1K93

BX
8061
A1
K78
1930

J. C. Mattes' Collection

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

Entered at the Post Office in Springfield, Ohio, as second-class matter under Act of August 12, 1912.

THE LUTHERAN LITURGY AND LIFE[1]

JOHN FREDERICK KRUEGER
Springfield, Ohio

THE Roman Catholic theologian Guéranger[2] characterizes Protestantism as the "anti-liturgical heresy." Another writer of the same church[3] applies this term approvingly to the Lutheran church and substantiates this statement by saying: "Still more characteristic than the juridic theory of justification is for it (Lutheranism) the rejection of the sacrifice, i. e. of the liturgy in the sense of the ancient church, and the denial of a separate office of the liturgist, by which the Old and New Testaments understood mediatorial persons, and not only representatives of the people or even preachers." If these words are a correct definition of liturgics and the liturgist, we are more than willing to concede that Lutheranism is indeed the "anti-liturgical heresy."

If, on the other hand, the liturgist is not the mediatorial priest standing in persona Christi between the congregation and God, repeating in an unbloody manner the bloody sacrifice of Calvary, but rather the servant of God, belonging to the universal priesthood of believers, called by his Lord for the office of the ministry, conducting the worship of the congregation according to ancient and established forms, then we have a right to say that the Lutheran church from its very inception has been a liturgical church.

This attitude is regarded by some as the greatest weakness of the Church of the Reformation. The Lutheran liturgy represents to them fossilized, and petrified, Lutheranism, dead formalism without a soul, perhaps even an undesirable remnant of Roman Catholicism.

1 Inaugural address, Dec. 10, 1929, on the occasion of the author's induction as professor of practical theology in Hamma Divinity School.

2 *Institutions liturgiques* (1840).

3 Valentin Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik* (1912), I, p. 137.

6486

Others, however feel inclined to apply to the Lutheran liturgy the inspiring words of James Russell Lowell:

> Chants, that a thousand years have heard,
> I love to hear again,
> For visions of the olden times
> Are wakened by the strain;
> With gorgeous hues the window-glass
> Seems suddenly to glow,
> And rich and red the streams of light
> Down through the chancel flow.

A study of the Lutheran Liturgy and Life will enable us to assign a proper place to the liturgy of our church.

THE LUTHERAN LITURGY IS AN OUTGROWTH AND AN EXPRESSION OF THE LIFE OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH

The entire cultus of Christ and of apostolic Christendom marks a complete change from the Old Testament conception of worship. As the object of the Old Testament service of God we behold Jehovah, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, surrounded by cherubim, crying to one another: "Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts." On the day for the temple service, at the rising of the sun, before the morning sacrifice was offered to the Lord, the people were reminded of this solemn fact by the repetition of the sacred words of the Shema: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord."[4]

A holy and righteous God, unapproachable to his people, necessitated the appointment of the office of the priest, arrayed in gorgeous garments, bearing the breastplate on his heart, wearing the holy crown on his head—the mitre with its golden plate bearing the significant inscription: "Holy to Jehovah"; and of the high-priest, to whom alone was given the right to enter the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement, and to make satisfaction for the sins of the people, the priests and himself. It was the function of this office to stand in a mediatorial relationship between a holy God and an unholy people. The priest was "the vehicle of divine grace, the mediator through whose ministry the sins of the community,

4 Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Num. 15:37-41.

as of the individual, could be atoned for." The decision of rabbis declared logically that "the priests were the emissaries not of the people, but of God," so that even their garments were efficacious in atoning for sin.[5]

For the performance of this sacred task, which separated the priest from the people, the מזבח, the θυσιαστήριον, the Old Testament altar, the place of slaughter, the place of sacrifice, was absolutely essential. Of the altar it could be said: "It wipes away sin; it nourishes the higher man; it fosters love to God; and it atones for all guilt."[6]

The idea of the מזבח, the θυσιαστήριον, included the conception of a divinely appointed ceremonial worship, unalterably prescribed in its minutest details by Jehovah himself. To the entire law of God, including the ceremonial, the fearful curse was attached: "If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, JEHOVAH THY GOD; then Jehovah will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sickness and of long continuance."[7]

This conception of the Old Testament λειτυργία was completely and definitely set aside by Christ. While the Master fully recognized the worship of the Old Testament with its God-given forms as a necessary part of the plan of the Almighty in the preparatory training of his chosen people, yet after all it was for him only the shadow of good things to come. And therefore he, "a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek,"[8] a high-priest who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens," appeared "once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."[10] Having thus entered into the Holy of Holies not made with hands, he "ever liveth to make in-

5 *The Jewish Encyclopaedia,* X, 195.
6 Ket. 10 b.
7 Deut. 28:58-59.
8 Heb. 7:17.
9 Heb. 7:26.
10 Heb. 9:26.

tercession for us."[11] In other words, with him and through him, the eternal high-priest, the mediatorial office of the priesthood is abolished and in its place appears the universal priesthood of believers, and the office of the ministry proceeding from the universal priesthood.

With the Old Testament priesthood the Old Testament altar disappears. The word θυσιαστήριον is used in the New Testament only with reference to the Old Testament altar, except in one passage, Hebrews 13:10: "We have an altar (θυσιαστήριον), whereof they have no right to eat that serve the tabernacle." This altar is the cross of Christ, of him who has become our high-priest (ἀρχιερεύς), as well as the sacrifice (θυσία).

New Testament liturgics, however, not only does away with the Old Testament cult; it also introduces a new positive principle of worship which finds its fullest expression in the words which Christ addressed to the woman at Jacob's well: "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father..... But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and truth."[12] These words contain the heart of New Testament liturgics, from which life flows into the body of Christ, his church. Not outward ceremonies, not even a divinely appointed liturgy, forms and rituals given by the Almighty are the essence of New Testament worship, but the free, living and life-giving relationship in spirit and in truth with a Father in heaven, who is Spirit, who is truth. This definition of New Testament liturgics, as laid down by Christ, does not, of course, destroy or do away with forms and ceremonies in worship. It merely replaces dead and meaningless forms by living intercourse with God. It demands that all liturgical worship, no matter how it may be expressed, must be judged by its spiritual content, its possibility to produce true and spiritual life. According to this standard an

11 Heb. 7:25.
12 John 4:21, 23-24.

elaborate liturgy which expresses spiritual life and produces spiritual life may embody most clearly New Testament liturgical principles, while a worship which rejects all forms and which lacks life may become dead formalism.

It was this principle which found expression in the worship of the early Christian congregation, a worship which certainly did not lack all semblance of order, but which was based upon a well recognized order brought about in the congregation by the life-giving Spirit of God, and throbbing with life. The application of this principle made it possible for the early Christian church to retain even certain elements of the service of the synagogue which did not conflict with the Christian idea of worship: the reading of the Scripture lesson, psalms, prayers with the responding Amen of the people, and preaching. Paul sums up this idea when he says: "When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation,"[13] a passage which leads Strack and Zoeckler to say: "Perhaps an order of service as found in the usual arrangement of the worship of the congregation."

The Lutheran liturgical reform of the sixteenth century is a return to the principles of Christ and of the early church, and therefore we have a right to present the second proposition:

THE LUTHERAN LITURGY IS THE PULSE-BEAT OF THE LIFE OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Thalhofer makes the significant statement: "In the liturgy beats the life-pulse of the Catholic church and of all Catholic life."[14] The correctness of this assertion is brought out very clearly in the period beginning with the post-Apostolic age and with the Reformation.

During the first two centuries there is no intimation that the term "sacerdos" is applied to the clergy. The congregation still constitutes the priesthood of believers; the idea of a special sacrifice offered by a divinely appointed priesthood does not exist.

13 I Cor. 14:26.
14 *Op. cit.*, I, 60.

Justin gives expression to this idea when he says: "We are the true high-priestly people of God, as God himself witnesses, saying, that in every place among the people who offer well-pleasing sacrifices, God accepts the sacrifices of none except through his priests."[15] Tertullian still emphasizes the universal priesthood, and yet he refers to the mediatorial character of the prayer of the priest and applies the term "summus episcopus" to the bishop. Gradually it became customary in the church to designate bishops and presbyters as sacerdotes. Cyprian places the priesthood of believers definitely into the background and transfers the idea of the levitical and Aaronitic priesthood to the priests. *They* are the representatives of God, *they* offer the sacrifices, consisting not merely of prayers but of the elements of the eucharist. How deeply this conception had entered into the consciousness of the church, may be seen from the words of the prayer in the Apostolic Constitutions uttered at the ordination of a bishop.

> Thou who from the beginning has ordained priests for the guidance of the people ...., Thou who hast never left thy holy place without priests (ἀλειτούργητον), pour out at this time also the power of Thy Spirit of governance and give to this Thy servant whom Thou hast elected a bishop unto Thyself, that he may be Thy high-priest (ἀριχερατεύειν σοι), administer without blemish by day and by night the holy liturgy, reconcile Thy countenance and offer unto Thee the gifts of Thy church, the pure and unbloody sacrifice, the mystery of the New Testament.[16]

Naturally the idea of a special priesthood found expression in the conception of the sacrifice. The Apostolic Constitutions have definitely adopted the θυσιαστήριον, gifts are brought πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον; the representatives of the church are παρεδρεύοντες τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ (those who are attending the place of sacrifice). This, of necessity, led to the idea of the third century that the New Testament sacerdos not only presents to the Almighty the gifts of the people, but the gifts for the people, i. e. that he becomes the mediator between God and man. The priests become "dispensatores Dei," "judices vice Christi, sacerdotes Christi."[17]

15 *Dial.* 116.
16 *Apostolic Constitutions,* VIII, 5.
17 Cyprian *ep.* 595.

Clearly and definitely this conception is contained in the Roman liturgy. The very place at which the liturgy is conducted calls this fact to our attention. The altar as the θυσιαστήριον must be consecrated by the bishop and without this consecration the Mass is not valid; a railing must separate the holy place from the nave; holy garments must be worn by the priest to set him aside from the people, and above all things the bloody sacrifice of Calvary must be repeated in an unbloody manner by the priest. The universal priesthood of believers disappears completely and its place is taken by a special priesthood. The priest becomes an *alter Christus, the creator Creatoris.* It is not inconsistent to apply to him the words: "Le prêtre un autre Jésus Christ."[18]

The Ordo and Canon Missae are built up upon these ideas. In the very introductory part the priest must "prepare himself carefully for the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass, in which he does not only pray in a mediatorial capacity, but also offers in the consecration the mysterious act of sacrifice (the tremendum sacrificium) and partakes in the communion of the most blessed sacrifical meal of the New Testament."[19] The different parts of the Canon of the Mass have a direct relationship to the sacrifice; in fact without this conception the Mass would lose its entire significance. The oratio super oblata (Sacramentary of Gregory) or secreta (Gelasianum) express the idea that the priest utters these prayers not merely as the representative of the people, but as the mediator. In the Sanctus and Benedictus the joy of the Christian over the coming of Christ in the transubstantiation finds expression, and this idea culminates in the act of consecration, in which the priest speaks not only *nomine ecclesiae,* but *nomine Christi,* as the visible representative of Christ.

This conception of Roman Catholic liturgics is a direct negation of the liturgical principles of Christ, and therefore the reformers of the sixteenth century found themselves confronted by a twofold task: (1) the necessity of abandoning liturgical ideas

18 Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man,* p. 113: "I once heard it announced literally at a first mass, 'Le prêtre un autre Jésus Christ.'"

19 Thalhofer, *op. cit.,* II, 34.

opposed to the New Testament; (2) the necessity of reaffirming New Testament liturgical ideas. And therefore we have a right to say that in the Lutheran liturgy we feel the pulse-beat of the life of the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

The living and life-giving heart-throb of Lutheran liturgics of the Reformation period finds expression in the fundamental principle that all liturgical worship must center around the Word of God and not around the sacrifice of the Mass. By proclaiming this revolutionary view Luther with one majestic stroke overthrew the entire man-made Judaizing system of Roman Catholicism and replaced it by the God-made New Testament conception that God is Spirit and that they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. As early as 1516 in the discussion of the third commandment (published in Latin in 1518), he emphasizes the necessity of "audire verbum." In his "Sermon Concerning the New Testament" of 1520 he stresses the necessity of the sermon as an explanation of the Mass. In his eight sermons in the Pfarrkirche in Wittenberg (1521), directed against the Zwickau prophets, he proclaims the conviction that the Mass can be, and must be, abolished only through the Word. In his tract "Of the Order of Divine Worship in the Congregation" (Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts in der Gemeine, 1523), a tract of which Kliefoth says: "In this first word, which was uttered by the Lutheran Church on matters of divine worship, lie its principles in full," Luther definitely develops his ideas with regard to the central position which he wishes to assign the Word of God. "The Christian congregation," he writes, "shall never assemble, unless the *Word of God be preached* and prayers be offered, even though this be done very briefly."[20] And in concluding his discussion he states clearly and concisely:

> There are other things which will shape themselves in the course of time, but the chief thing is that everything be done in such manner, that *the Word of God may have free course,* and not again become a howl and a sound as it heretofore has been. It were better *that everything else were abandoned*

20 W. A., 12, 35: "Dass die Christliche gemeyne nymer soll zu sammen komen, es werde denn daselbs Gottes wort gepredigt und gebett, es sey auffs kurtzist."

rather than the Word. For that it should have free course among Christians the whole Scripture shows and Christ himself said, Luke X: 'One thing is needful,' namely, that Mary should sit at Christ's feet and hear His Word daily, which is that best part which she has chosen, and which shall never be taken away from her. There is one eternal Word. Everything else must pass away no matter how much concern it may cause Martha. To this may God help us. Amen[21]

All principles pertaining to Lutheran liturgics must be considered from this central conception. In his reformation of the Mass, and its adaptation to the Lutheran service, the reformer places himself firmly upon the life-giving Word. Christ, having by his own blood entered in once in the holy place, has obtained eternal redemption for us. What need is there then for a repetition of this sacrifice in the Mass? Indignantly Luther exclaims: "I hold .... that the Papistic priesthood and sacrifice of the Mass are most assuredly the work of the devil, by which he has led the world into error and deceived it."[22] When his opponents called his attention to the fact that the great teachers of the church had regarded the Mass as a sacrifice, he boldly swept aside man-made ideas and put into their place the eternal thus-saith-the-Lord: "Again they call our attention to the holy fathers, who have used this canon and have considered the Mass as a sacrifice, as Gregory, Bernhardus, Bonaventura and others. To this I reply, that nothing is more terrible than the work and life of the saints, which are not founded upon the Scriptures."[23]

21 W. A., 12, 37: "Anders mehr wirt sich mit der tzeyt selb geben, wenn es angehet. Aber die Summa sey die, das ia alles geschehe, das das wort ym schwang gehe und nicht widderumb eyn loren und dohnen drauss werde, wie bisher gewesen ist. Es ist alles besser nach gelassen, denn das wort. Und ist nichts besser getrieben denn das wort. Denn das das selb sollt ym schwang unter den Christen gehen, tzeygt die gantze schrifft an, und Christus auch selb sagt, Luce X 'Eyns ist von notten.' Nemlich das Maria tzu Christus fussen sitze und hore seyn wort teglich, das ist das beste teyl, das zurwelen ist, und nymer weg genomen wirt. Est is eyn ewig wort, das ander muss alles vergehen, wie viel es auch der Martha zuschaffen gibt. Dazu helff uns Gott. Amen."

W. A., 8, 499, Vom Missbrauch der Messe: "Ich halt.... dass diss Bepstisch priesterthum und Mess opffern gewisslich der teuffels werk sey, damit er die wellt ynn Yrrthum gefurt und betrogen hat."

23 *Ibid.*, p. 527: "Zum andern, werffen sie uns fur die heyligen vetter, welche diesen Canon gebraucht und die mess fur eyn opffer gehalden haben, als Gregorius, Bernhardus, Bonaventura und andere mehr. Dazu anttwortte ich, das nichts ferlicher is, denn der heylgen werk und leben, die nicht in der schrifft gegrundet sind."

The abolition of the sacrifice of the Mass resulted naturally in the setting aside of the special office of the mediatorial priesthood and the restoration of the biblical idea of the universal priesthood of believers. As early as 1521 Luther wrote: "First of all we desire to deal with the priesthood in order that every true Christian may know that there is no external visible priest in the New Testament, except those whom the devil has raised up and instituted through the lies of men. We have only one universal priest, Christ, who has offered himself for us and all of us with him." (Reference is made to I Pet. 3 and Heb. 10). Boldly he confronts the Roman church with the challenge: "You noble priests, show us one jot or one line in all the gospels and epistles of the apostles, indicating that you are more, or that you are to be called priests for other Christians, or that your priesthood is something else than that which is common to all Christians."[24] And from all this he draws the conclusion: "This is a spiritual priesthood, which is common to all, through which all of us are priests with God, namely, we are children of Christ, the highest priest, neither do we need another priest or mediator beside Christ."[25]

The consideration of the activity of Luther in rejecting all liturgical ideas which did not harmonize with the Word of God might lead us to draw the conclusion of Gottschick that "Luther showed little interest in liturgics,"[26] or that of Franz Rendtorff, a modern authority on liturgics, that Luther was "un-liturgical" or even "anti-liturgical."[27] However, a study of the positive liturgical ideas of the reformer, expressed through his writings and actual reforms, will show that this conception is not correct.

While, on the one hand, Luther was eager to cleanse the

24 *Ibid.*, p. 488: "Ihr edlen pfaffen, tzeygt uns eyn punctel odder eyn strichel ynn allen Evengelien oder Episteln der Aposteln, dass yhr seyth, oder sollt priester anders seyn, denn das gemeyn aller Christen priesterthum."

25 *Ibid.*, p. 486: "Dies ist eyn geystlich priesterthum, allen Christen gemeyn, da durch wyr alle mit Christo priester sind, das ist, wyr sind kinder Christi, des hochsten priesters, wir durffen auch keyns andern priesters oder mittlers denn Christum."

26 J. Gottschick, *Luthers Anschauungen vom christlichen Gottesdienst* (1887), p. 31 *Ibid.*, p. 37: "wie bisher gewonnet Messz und Vesper singen."

27 *Die Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes unter dem Gesichtspunkt der liturgischen Erbfolge.*

liturgy from the dross which in the course of centuries had been mingled with it, he refrained, on the other hand, from using iconoclastic methods and gladly retained the grains of gold found in it. From his earliest reformatory period he gives expression to this idea. On January 29, 1523, he had given promise to the congregation at Leisning "to arrange an order, to sing, to pray, and to read."[28] When this church introduced radical reforms, doing away with robes and clerical garments, while the pastor administered communion "slecht im rock," i. e. simply in his every-day clothing, the order was issued in 1529 that it would be advisable for this congregation to return to the conservative practice of Wittenberg.[29]

This constructive conservatism as a life principle of the liturgical conception of Luther finds expression time and again. "Just as we do not do away with the office of the ministry, but rather desire to bring it back to its rightful position," he says, "thus it is not our opinion to do away with the service, but to restore it to its rightful place."[30] He admonishes the congregations "according to former usage to sing Mass and Vespers,"[31] to retain "hymns during the Sunday Mass, for they are good and taken from the Scriptures, although they may be shortened or lengthened."[32]

The Baptismal Book in German appeared in 1523. It was practically a translation of the liturgical forms used in Wittenberg.[33] During the same year there was published his Baptismal Liturgy.[34]

Early in 1523 Luther had also written to his friend, Nicolaus Hausmann, who on several occasions had asked for an order of service: "For a long time I have thought of prescribing a form for conducting the Mass and the communion, but I have not, up to

28 W. A., 12, 31.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

30 W. A., 12, 35-7, Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts in der Gemeine: "widder yn rechten schwang zu setzen."

31 *Ibid.*, p. 37: "wie bisher gewonnet Messz und Vesper singen."

32 *Ibid.*, p. 37: "Das gesenge ynn den sontags messen las man bleyben, denn sie sind fast gutt und aus der schrifft gezogen, doch man mags wenigen odder mehren."

33 *Ibid.*, pp. 38 ff.

34 *Ibid.*, pp. 51-2.

the present time, been able to carry it out."[35] Shortly afterwards he wrote that "in the near future he would publish something, through which he would describe the form of conducting the service."[36] Finally, on December 4, 1523, he sent the complete order to Hausmann in Zwickau.[37]

Instead of saying that Luther was *unliturgical* or *anti-liturgical,* we have a right to say that from the very beginning of his reformatory activity he was enthusiastically liturgical. At the same time his enthusiasm was tempered by conservatism. He never overlooked the fact that a liturgy will become nothing but dead formalism unless it expresses the life of the church.

Consequently all Lutheran liturgical practices must be based upon Christian liberty. They are not chains which hold consciences captive, but the free expression of the soul liberated by the Gospel. They are not laws of the church made binding upon the child of God, but expressions of the free service of the congregation worshipping God in spirit and in truth. "This is our opinion with regard to the Mass," he declares. "In all these things we must watch carefully that we do not make a law out of liberty, or feel that those are sinning who either do things differently, or omit some things, just so that the words of preaching remain inviolate and these things be done through faith."[38]

At the same time he was anxious to safeguard this position in order that liberty might not be changed into license. True liturgical liberty includes three principles:

(1) Fundamental doctrines cannot be judged by the law of liberty. Any part of the liturgy which is contrary to the Word of God is eo ipso condemned. In applying this principle to the Mass he says:

> That they make a sacrifice out of it (the Mass) does not merely mean that they make a ceremony out of it, but that they change completely and

35 "Ego diu meditatus sum formam missandi et communicandi prescribere, nec potui hactenus absolvere."

36 *Ibid.,* p. 205: "ut breve aliquid typis edam, quo formam missandi depingam."

37 *Formula Missae et Communionis.*

38 W. A., 12, 214: "Sic de missa sentimus. In quibus omnibus cavendum, ne legem ex libertate faciamus, aut peccare cognamus eos, qui vel aliter fecerint, vel quae dam omiserint, modo benedictionis verba sinant interga et fide his agant."

absolutely the nature and meaning of the sacrament. This is not only opposed to all precedent, but is done in opposition to the word and example of Christ, so that even Christian liberty cannot excuse it, for it is the greatest damnable idolatry and blasphemy of God.[39]

(2) Liturgical liberty permits us to retain any part of the service or any liturgical observance which is not opposed to the Word. In this conception Luther differed fundamentally from the Reformed theologians, who desired to retain only that which was directly ordered by the Word. It is here that the life of the Lutheran liturgy manifests itself in many points which are regarded as adiaphora. We might refer to the wearing of clerical robes. Luther himself had laid aside his monkish robe in his home in 1523 while he still used it in the church service. On the ninth of October, 1524, he wore the monkish robe at the morning service, while in the afternoon he went into the pulpit wearing his academic robe, a custom which he retained after this time.

We shall pass by, he says, the question of vestments. But about these we hold the same as about other rites. We permit their use freely, just so that pomp and luxury be absent. For you are not more pleasing if you preach in vestments, nor are you less pleasing if you preach without vestments. For vestments certainly do not commend us to God.[40]

On Dec. 4, 1539, he wrote his well-known letter to Provost Bucholzer who was undecided what to do with regard to the request of the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg to retain cowl and surplice in processions on feast days and to walk about the church yard on Sundays and on Easter:

If your Lord, the Margrave and Elector, allows you to preach the gospel of Christ purely without man's additions, and permits the sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper according to Christ's appointment, then in God's name go round with them carrying a silver or gold cross, and a cowl or surplice of velvet, silk or linen. And if one of these be not enough, then put

39 *Ibid.*, p. 511.

40 "Vesta praeterivimus. Sed de his ut de aliis ritibus sentimus. Permittamus illis utere libere, modo pompa et luxus absit. Neque enim magis places, si in vestibus benedixeris. Nec minus places, si sine vestibus benedixeris. Neque enim vestes etiam nos deo commendant."

on three, as did Aaron, the High Priest, each one more beautiful than another, from which church vestments in the Papacy are named Ornata. And if your Lord, the Elector, be not satisfied with one procession, then go round seven times, as Joshua went round Jericho with the children of Israel, blowing trumpets. And if your lord has a desire, let him go in front, springing and dancing with harps, and cymbals, drums and bells, as did David when they brought the ark of the Lord up to Jerusalem. I have no objections to that. For such things, if not abused, neither add to nor take from the Gospel, but they must never be regarded as necessary.[41]

What a difference between the conception of Zwingli who as early as 1523 had declared that robes, crosses, etc., are not only neither good nor bad, but are absolutely bad, and the conception of Luther who was willing to retain all these things, as long as they did not interfere with the Word and the sacraments but helped in the worship of God in spirit and in truth!

(3) An overemphasis of these ideas would lead to disorder within the church, and therefore it became necessary to add the third principle: Liturgical liberty requires unity within the church for the sake of order. This unity of order, however, must not be based upon compulsion, but upon the free expression of the worship of the Christian congregation. Clearly the Apology upholds this principle in the statement: "We believe that the true unity of the church is not injured by dissimilar rites instituted by men. Although it is pleasing to us that, for the sake of unity and good order, universal rites be observed."[42] And again: "But we cheerfully maintain the old traditions made in the church for the sake of usefulness and tranquility .... and our enemies falsely accuse us of abolishing good ordinances and church discipline."[43]

The streams of life flowing from the liturgical principles of Christ and the early Christian church to, and through, the period of the Reformation, have poured their life-giving waters into the Lutheran church transplanted to a new continent, and again it becomes true that

41 Margaret A. Currie, *The Letters of Martin Luther,* pp. 378-9.
42 *Apology,* Chap. IV, 33.
43 *Apology,* Chap. VIII, Art. XV, 39.

THE LIFE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH OF AMERICA FINDS AN EXPRESSION IN ITS LITURGY

Firmly all the branches of the Lutheran church of America stand upon the declaration of the Augsburg Confession: "Unto the true unity of the church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites or ceremonies instituted by men should be alike everywhere."[44] The Courtland Liturgy brings out this idea precisely when it declares: "All Christians must be carefully taught at all times of the great difference there is between the ceremonies arranged by men for use in the church, and the Word of God, which alone saves, and the two sacraments; for these two, namely the Word of God and the two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are the sole necessary means for salvation which, without sin against the conscience, and without unavoidable offense against the Church of God, neither can nor may be perverted, changed, enlarged, or diminished by angels or men. Wherefore Paul says distinctly, Gal. I, 'If we, or an angel from heaven, preach unto you another gospel, let him be accursed. And in I Cor. XI, 'I have received of the Lord that which also I deliver unto you.' He also mentions the institution of the Supper. Then he speaks distinctly of ceremonies, saying, 'And the rest will I set in order when I come.' " A Lutheran service which does not have as its center the eternal Word of God is unthinkable. From the Invocation with its trinitarian formula, through the Introits taken largely from the Psalms, through the magnificent Gloria in excelsis, sung centuries ago on Bethlehem's fields, to the reading of the Gospel and Epistle lessons, continuing with the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and ending with the grand Amen after the solemn Aaronic benediction, the Lutheran liturgy enthrones the divine Word of God. Through its liturgy the Lutheran church of America takes its position unqualifiedly upon the Bible, and gives expression to its innermost life by singing the words of the battle-hymn of the Reformation.

44 *Augsburg Confession*, Art. VII.

While on this point there cannot be any difference of opinion on the part of all who claim the name of Lutheran, yet in the development of liturgical forms there has been the greatest variety, thus giving full expression to the principle of liturgical liberty. The Lutheran church of America has strictly observed the admonition of Luther in his German Mass:

> Before all things I kindly beseech, even for God's sake, all those who desire to see or to follow this our order in divine service, that they by no means make a necessary law out of it, nor entangle or bind anyone's conscience therewith; but that, in accordance with Christian liberty, they use their pleasure, as to how, where, and when and how long the circumstances suit or demand it. . . . . Yet I will not ask all those who have their good order of service, or who through God's grace can make a better one, to let it go and yield to us. For it is not my intention that all Germany should accept precisely our Wittenberg order.

A brief reference to the liturgical history of the former General Synod will illustrate this point. From its very inception the oldest general body of Lutherans in the United States, the General Synod, let it be known that it intended to cling to the liturgical observances of the past. As early as 1825 it appointed a committee "to prepare a Hymn-Book, Liturgy and a collection of Prayers in the English language for the use of our church."[45] Naturally this liturgy connected the life of the Lutheran church of America with the life of the mother church in Germany. This fact found expression in the instructions given the committee: to adhere in the preparation of the Hymn-Book and Liturgy "particularly to the New York Hymn-Book, and the German Liturgy of Pennsylvania as their guides."[46] The liturgy, as finally adopted, was to a large extent a translation of the liturgy of Pennsylvania, so that the statement could be made: "It is, in the strictest sense, the liturgy of the American Lutheran Church, since it originated in that part of the church which is the mother of us all and which even to-day is held in the highest reverence by the oldest congregations of our denomination."[47]

45 *Minutes of General Synod*, 1825, p. 9.
46 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
47 *Minutes*, 1841, p. 51.

It is to be regretted that the task of revising the liturgy, or of giving to the church a new liturgy, was undertaken at a time of doctrinal discussion within the General Synod. And yet what an interesting light upon the life of the General Synod during the middle of the past century the liturgical discussions of this period throw! While the committee on the liturgy reported at the meeting at York, Pa., in 1864, that the General Synod's liturgy should be the basis on which the new liturgy should be constructed, yet it was compelled to add: "Resolved, that on all subjects on which difference of doctrinal sentiment exists, Scripture language suited to either or both views is to be employed without comment."[48] The so-called Washington service, which was the outcome of the liturgical discussions of this time, shows plainly the result of the life of the General Synod of this time; for the committee informed the general body of the fact that it took the larger part of the new liturgy "from the former liturgy of the General Synod, the next largest portion from the Pennsylvania Synod's English Liturgy, others from the New York Liturgy, and a few from the forms of Dr. Seiss"[49]

Soon after this period, however, the life of the General Synod manifested itself through two tendencies: (1) the desire for a more definitely Lutheran liturgy; (2) the desire for unity in the Lutheran church. The movement for a Common Service, based upon "the common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century and, when there is not entire agreement among them, the consent of the largest number of greatest weight" gave expression to these tendencies. Not only did this service which was finally adopted in 1887, give a common liturgy to the United Synod in the South, the General Council and the General Synod, but it was at the same time the first step toward the final union of these three bodies into the United Lutheran Church in America.

It would be wrong to assume that the Common Service has in any way destroyed the principle of liturgical liberty as a part of the life of the Lutheran church of America. As early as 1831 the

48 *Minutes*, 1864, p. 26.
49 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

General Synod Constitution declared: "No General Synod can be allowed to possess, or arrogate unto itself the power of prescribing among us uniform ceremonies of religion for every part of the church."[50] Again, when the committee to prepare the Common Service met in 1884, it adopted the following guiding principles: (1) The result of the committee's labor must be referred to the bodies they represent. (2) No service dare be made binding on the congregation. (3) We are to provide the full Lutheran service with all its provisions for all who wish to use it, and leave the congregation free in the use of it. In 1885 another significant statement was added: "If at any time or place the use of the full service is not desired, it is in entire conformity with good Lutheran usage that a simpler service may be provided and used, in which only the principal parts of the service in their order are contained."

While thus the Lutheran Liturgy in the United States safeguards the principle of liberty, at the same time it gives expression to its conservative character by stressing just as emphatically the blessings of unity and uniformity, as long as they are expressions of worship in spirit and in truth. With the Apology our church declares: "We believe that the true unity of the church is not injured by dissimilar rites, instituted by men. *Although it is pleasing to us that, for the sake of unity and good order, universal rites be observed.* It is this principle of Lutheranism which makes it possible for our church to express its life through uniform liturgical observances not only in this country but also in the foreign field, yea which forms a bond of union of world-Lutheranism.

To these liturgical principles and practices which are the expression of the life of our Lutheran church, I solemnly pledge myself on the day of my installation. They shall guide me not only in my conception of liturgics but of the entire field of theology. As our church places the Word of God into the center of the liturgy, thus without reservation I subscribe, as the basis for all my teaching, to the statement of our constitution: "I receive and hold the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God, and as the only infallible rule and

50 *Apology*, Chap. IV, 33.

standard of faith and practice, according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged." But, as on the basis of this living foundation, our church in the course of centuries has built up its liturgy and has ever conceded the right of subtracting from and adding to these forms, whenever the changing conditions and conceptions of the church have made a more perfect expression of the worship of God in spirit and in truth desirable and possible, thus I do not pledge myself either to a liturgy or to a theology which in all its details and expressions is a closed book, but to a living liturgy and a living theology which give expression to the ever growing life of the kingdom of God. As the church of the Reformation, while desiring uniformity in the worship of God, provided this uniformity flows forth from, and is an expression of, the life of the body of Christ, yet concedes the greatest liberty to its people and pastors in the use of the liturgy and has never made uniform customs the prerequisite of church unity, thus in all questions which relate to adiaphora and open questions, I shall ask for the application of the principle of Christian liberty for myself and my teaching, and shall grant this Christian liberty to my colleagues and to the students in the classroom. In all my work I shall be guided by the motto: *"In necessariis unitas; in dubiis libertas; in omnibus caritas." In essentials unity; in non-essentials liberty; in all things charity.*

The following material is included in this bulletin as a matter of information and record.

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL FORMALLY INDUCTS DR. JOHN F. KRUEGER IN CHAIR OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

Representatives of 41 educational institutions were in attendance, and messages of good will from 94 other institutions were read in connection with the ceremonies held at Wittenberg college recently on the occasion of the formal induction of Rev. John F. Krueger, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., as professor of practical theology in Hamma Divinity School.

Members of the Board of Directors of Wittenberg college in annual mid-winter session which began with a special session on behalf of the seminary participated in the imposing academic procession.

The charge to the professor-elect was made by the Rev. Dr. H. C. Roehner, of Mansfield, president of the board of directors. The liturgical service was in charge of the Rev. Dr. E. G. Howard, pastor of the Fourth Lutheran church where the installation took place. Dr. L. H. Larimer, dean of the seminary, presided at the installation services.

Following the ceremony, distinguished visitors from seminaries, universities and colleges, joined in a banquet at the Fourth Lutheran church in honor of the new professor, and many were heard in short addresses there. President Rees Edgar Tulloss, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., of Wittenberg, presided at the banquet.

In his installation address, Dr. Krueger spoke of the Lutheran liturgy, explained its important place in the worship at Lutheran churches, and told how the life of the Lutheran Church in America finds an expression in its liturgy.—*From "The Lutheran," Jan. 9, 1930.*

THE SERVICES OF INSTALLATION

Dean Loyal H. Larimer, D.D., presiding

Prelude—"Toccata and Fugue in D Minor" . . . *Bach*

Hymn 197

Liturgical Service
Rev. Elmer G. Howard, D.D.,
Secretary of the Board of Directors

Anthem—"Blessing and Glory" . . . . *J. F. Ohl*

Charge to the Professor-elect
Rev. Henry C. Roehner, D.D.,
President of the Board of Directors

Address—"The Lutheran Liturgy and Life"

Professor-Elect John Frederick Krueger, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.

The Act of Installation

Anthem—"Open Our Eyes" . . . *MacFarlane*

Introduction of Representatives

Hymn 224

Benediction

REPRESENTATIVES OF INSTITUTIONS

The following institutions appointed personal representatives:

Adrian College: Rev. H. E. Orwick, A.M., B.D.
Auburn Theological Seminary: Prof. Gaius Glenn Atkins, L.H.D., DD.
Bangor Theological Seminary: Rev. Harry Trust, A.B., D.D.
Bonebrake Theological Seminary: Prof. C. E. Ashcraft, A.M., B.D., D.D.
Cedarville College: Pres. W. R. McChesney, A.M., Ph.D., D.D.
Central Theological Seminary: Prof. George C. Stibitz, Ph.D., D.D.
Centre College: Mr. Walter O. Hopper, A.B.
Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary: Rev. A. H. Keck, D.D.
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School: Rev. Irving Newton De Puy, A.B.
Crozer Theological Seminary: Prof. Frank Grant Lewis, A.M., B.D., Ph.D.
Divinity School of Kenyon College: Prof. William C. Seitz, A.M., D.D., S.T.M.
Divinity School of Yale University: Prof. John Ruskin Howe, A.B., B.D., Ph.D.
Earlham College: Rev. O. Herschel Folger, A.M., B.D.
Eden Theological Seminary: Rev. Paul Pfeiffer, B.D.
Garrett Biblical Institute: Rev. Nathaniel E. Butler, A.B., B.D.
Gettysburg Theological Seminary: Prof. H. D. Hoover, Ph.D., D.D., S.T.D.
Grove City College: Prof. F. L. Bach, Ph.B., A.M., Mus.D.
Hebrew Union College: Rabbi Lewis Witt, A.B.
Howard University: Leo C. Robinson, M.D.
Kenyon College: Rev. Philip Porter, A.B., D.D.
Lake Erie College: Prof. Earl Vinie, Ed.M., B.D., Ph.D.
Lane Theological Seminary: Pres. R. Ames Montgomery, D.D., LL.D.
Marietta College: Rev. Frederick W. Fischer, B.D., S.T.M.
Meadville Theological School: Rev. John Frederick Meyer, B.D.
Midland College: Prof. Paul Harold Heisey, A.M., B.D., Ph.D., D.D.
Mount Union College: Prof. Frank M. Shelton, S.B., A.M.
Muskingum College: Pres. J. Knox Montgomery, D.D., LL.D.
New Church Theological School: Rev. Franklin H. Blackmer, S.B.
Oberlin Graduate School of Theology: Rev. Walter N. James, A.B., Litt.M., B.D.
Otterbein College: Prof. J. S. Engler, A.M., B.D.
Simmons University: Rev. C. H. Parrish, A.M., D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S.
Susquehanna University: Rev. William H. Blough, A.B., B.D.
Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church: Rev. Clarence Woods, A.B.
University of Southern California: Prof. Kenneth M. Munroe, Th.M.
Washington and Jefferson College: Clement L. Jones, M.D.
Western College for Women: Pres. W. W. Boyd, A.M., Ped.D.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERITY: Rev. Robert F. McDowell, A.B., B.D.
WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: Rev. Walter Payne Harriman, D.D.
WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: Rev. Frank Lawrence Brown, A.B., S.T.B., D.D.
WILBERFORCE UNIVERSITY: Rev. John W. Arnold, B.D., D.D.
WITMARSUM THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: Pres. John Ellsworth Hartzler, A.M., B.D., Ph.D.

INSTITUTIONS SENDING OFFICIAL GREETINGS

Albright College, Reading, Pa.
Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.
Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
Alma College, Alma, Mich.
Armour Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.
Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.
Austin Presbyterian Theologicl Seminary, Austin, Tex.
Battle Creek College, Battle Creek, Mich.
Beaver College, Beaver, Pa.
Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Berea College, Berea, Ky.
Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
Biblical Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J.
Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio.
Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio.
Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
Christian Divinity School of Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio.
College of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.
College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio.
Columbia Theological Seminary, Columbia, Ga.
Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Mo.
Drake University, Des Moines, Ia.
Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Du Bose Memorial Church Training School, Monteagle, Tenn.
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa.
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.
Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.
Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.
Evangelical School of Theology, Reading, Pa.
Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.
General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Gordon College of Theology and Missions, Boston, Mass.
Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
Hope College, Holland, Mich.
Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.

John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio.
Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.
Lincoln College, Lincoln Ill.
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.
Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill.
Luther College, Decorah, Ia.
Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.
Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C.
Lutheran Seminary, Shekow, China.
Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind.
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
McPherson College, McPherson, Kan.
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis.
Minnesota College, Minneapolis, Minn.
Moravian Seminary and College for Women, Bethlehem, Pa.
Mt. Morris College, Mt. Morris, Ill.
Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.
Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
Outlook College, Saskatoon, Can.
Pacific Theological Seminary, Seattle, Wash.
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Omaha, Neb.
Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Roanoke College, Salem, Va.
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Ind.
San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Cal.
Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa.
Sewanee College, Sewanee, Tenn.
Shurtleff College, Alton, Ill.
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.
Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.
Texas Christian University, Ft. Worth, Tex.
Theological School of Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.
Theological School of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.
University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
University of Richmond, Richmond, Va.
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.
Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va.
Walla Walla College, College Place, Wash.
Western Theological Seminary, Fremont, Neb.
Western Union College, Le Mars, Ia.
Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.
William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.
Wittenberg in China, Kiachao, Shantung Province, China.

THE FELLOWSHIP BANQUET

FOURTH LUTHERAN CHURCH PARLORS

SIX *O'*CLOCK

President Rees Edgar Tulloss, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., presiding

Addresses were made by designated representatives as follows:

NAME	INSTITUTION OR SYNOD
Rev. Harry Trust, A.B., B.D.	Bangor Theological Seminary
Prof. William C. Seitz, A.M., B.D., S.T.M.,	Divinity School of Kenyon Coll.
Prof. John Ruskin Howe, A.B., B.D., Ph.D.	Divinity School of Yale Univ.
Prof. H. D. Hoover, Ph.D., D.D., S.T.D.	Gettysburg Theological Seminary
Pres. R. Ames Montgomery, D.D., LL.D. . .	Lane Theological Seminary
Prof. Frank Grant Lewis, A.M., B.D., Ph.D.	Crozer Theological Seminary
Rev. G. E. Swoyer, S.T.M.	Pittsburgh Synod
Pres. A. H. Keck, D.D.	The Michigan Synod
Pres. R. H. Benting, D.D.	The Indiana Synod
Pres. Joseph Sittler, D.D.	The Synod of Ohio

Rev. Prof. E. E. Flack. Th.D., read congratulatory greetings from many institutions.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.

PHOTOMOUNT
PAMPHLET BINDER
~
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N.Y.
Stockton, Calif.